HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE D.S.R.VARMA
AND
HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P.SWAROOP REDDY

TAKEN UP WRIT PETITION NO.13254 OF 2006
Dated:17.07.2006

–
–

Smt Dr.V.Varalakshmi

…Petitioner

The Station House Officer, Malakpet Police Station,
Malakpet, Hyderabad and five others.

…Respondents

HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE D.S.R.VARMA
AND
HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P.SWAROOP REDDY

TAKEN UP WRIT PETITION NO.13254 OF 2006

–
–

ORAL ORDER: *(per Hon'ble Sri Justice D.S.R.Varma)*

Heard the learned Government Pleader for Home, appearing for the respondents.

2. This writ petition is taken up on the basis of a petition, dated 14.06.2006, sent to this Court by one Dr.V.Varalakshmi, W/o Hariprasada Rao, Resident of Malakpet Colony, Hyderabad, *inter alia*, stating that some people (the names of those persons are not given) have been harassing and teasing her and causing

disturbances in various methods. But, no specific complaint is made against a specific individual.

3. Upon receiving notice from this Court, the first respondent- Inspector of Police, Malakpet Police Station, Hyderabad, filed counter affidavit, *inter alia*, stating that he caused an enquiry, which revealed that earlier, the petitioner filed W.P.No.21315 of 1999 before this Court seeking a direction to the Government to prosecute the Superintendent of Police, Prakasam District, under Section-197 Cr.P.C., which was subsequently dismissed.

4. It is further stated that the petitioner was in the habit of making frivolous and false petitions against the superior officers at her work place. Even now, in Malakpet colony, where she has been presently residing, the residents of the said colony also submitted a representation to the Police against the petitioner stating that she has been in the habit of taking advantage of the provisions of S.C./S.T. Act by filing false petitions against the Government servants for various reasons. It appears that the residents of the said locality, in fact, submitted a representation that it is the petitioner, who is actually disturbing the peace and tranquility of the locality. In the background of the above said facts, we cannot express our opinion either way, on the complaint made by the petitioner or on the representation submitted by the

residents of the said locality.

5. It is further brought to the notice of this Court that the petitioner gave a complaint against somebody to Police Personnel of Malakpet Police Station on 19.05.2006 and the same was registered as a case in Crime No.156 of 2006 for the offences under Section-3 (i) (x) of Schedule Caste and Schedule Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 and under Section-323 I.P.C., and was entrusted to the Assistant Commissioner of Police, Malakpet Division, for enquiry and the investigation into the said case is still pending.

6. From the above counter-affidavit, filed by the first respondent, it is clear that there is no actual and clear cause for the petitioner to make a petition of this sort. As already stated, all the complaints and grievances of the petitioner are very vague in nature. Further, in view of the controversy between the petitioner and the residents of the said locality, we deem it appropriate to close the writ petition, with a liberty to the petitioner to approach the appropriate Court of law under Section-200 Cr.P.C.

7. It is further on record that the petitioner made a complaint to the State Human Rights Commission also, in which event, she is at liberty to pursue the said remedy in an appropriate manner.

8. With the above observations, the writ petition is closed, at the stage of admission.

_____

D.S.R.VARMA, J

17.07.2006
DR

_____

P.SWAROOP REDDY, J